## REMARKS

The Examiner has objected to the drawings and specification in the Examiner's Action. Applicant has considered these objections and has found that wrong reference numerals were set forth in the specification. Accordingly, applicant, by the present Amendment, is amending and/or deleting reference numerals on pages 6 and 7 of the application to render the specification consistent with the drawings and to render same clear.

Accordingly, applicant submits that, once the amendments to the specification are entered, the Examiner's objections to the specification and drawings will be obviated and rendered moot.

The Examiner's objections to the claims and his rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for being indefinite, as this rejection may be attempted to be applied to the amended claims, it is respectfully traversed.

In support of this traversed, applicant has amended the language in the claims to clarify same by, for example, changing "code data" to --instructions and data in binary form stored in said memory means--. Then applicant has changed "program means" to --program instructions in binary form--.

Further, applicant has amended the claims to define clearly how and where the data instructions are stored and how they are retrieved to effect certain functions. Additionally, applicant has indicated how sensing is done with the microprocessor to render the claims more clear.

Applicant submits that upon entry of the amendments to the claims, the claims will be found to be clear and definite and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 then will have been obviated and rendered moot.

The Examiner's rejection of claims 1-2, 6 and 11, as this rejection may be attempted to be applied to the amended claims, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for being clearly anticipated by the Kurita U.S. Patent No. 5,175,538 is respectfully traversed.

In support of this traverse, applicants' claimed remote control and method are directed to means for, and the steps for, enabling a user to reassign a different function to a key on a keypad on a remote control.

Kurita teaches a learning remote combined with a

programmable remote.

In a learning remote, one aims a dedicated remote control at the phototransistor input of the learning remote and learn the infrared signal codes stored in the dedicated remote control, as they are successively sent by the dedicated remote (upon depression by the user of respective keys of the dedicated remote control, e.g. Volume Up) to the learning remote.

In a programmable remote, instructions and code data, i.e. date relating to IR code signals for command functions, are stored in a memory of the remote at the factory where it is made.

In the Kurita combined learning and programmed remote commander, after the user has installed (using the learning function of the remote commander) remote control data, the user can then operate the remote commander using the learned code data for controlling a controllable device, such as a television set.

If the learned code data did not include instructions and data for operating a key on the keypad, the Kurita remote commander provides automatic switching means whereby on depression of a key where there is no learned function for that key, the automatic switching means will automatically default to the programmed or original remote control data stored in the memory of the remote commander.

In other words, if the user presses a key that has no learned function for that key, the remote commander defaults to the function for that key defined by the original remote control data stored in the memory of the remote commander.

Thus, Kurita does not disclose means for, or a method for, allowing a <u>user</u> to reassign a command function to a key on a keypad of a remote control and in no way discloses or suggests applicants' claimed remote control and method. All that Kurita teaches is defaulting to a programmed command function for a key when there is no learned function for the key when the user has stored (learned) command function data from a dedicated remote control in the remote commander.

The Examiner's rejection of claims 3-5 and 7-10 under 35 USC § 103 for being unpatentable (obvious) over Kurita in view of the Osborne et al. U.S. Patent 4,291,385, as this rejection may be attempted to be applied to the amended claims, is respectfully traversed.

In support of this traverse, Osborne et al. is non-analogous art since it is directed to a calculator and has nothing to do with a remote control.

Osborne et al. teaches an electronic calculator which has a keyboard with a set of 35 keys and a memory having a predetermined amount of memory space.

Each of the 35 keys on the Osborne et al. calculator requires a 6 bit code for defining its function. The Osborne et al. memory has space for 64 possible 6 bit codes. What Osborne et al. then teaches is assigning a second function to 29 of the keys of the keypad so that 29 of the 35 keys can have two key sequences. This is shown in FIG. 1 where a number of the keys have double labels.

The 1981 Osborne et al. patent is therefore concerned with using all the memory space in a memory chip when memory was hard to come by. All that Osborne et al. teaches is designating two functions to a key, and these functions are not determined by the user of the calculator; but rather are designed into the calculator by the manufacturer at the factory.

Osborne et al. does not at all teach reassignment table or program instructions for enabling a user to assign a different command function to a key on a keypad in a remote control.

Applicants submit that upon reconsideration of the amended claims in conjunction with the above remarks, it will be apparent that the amended claims 1, 7, 10 and 11 are clear of the art and patentable thereover; and therefore the amended claims are in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that end is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Reg. No. 24,542

Dated: January 11, 1995.

836 South Northwest Highway Barrington, ILLINOIS 60010 (708) 382-6500